

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated July 20, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-14 are rejected to by the Examiner. Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended. Claims 1-14 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,535,194 to Hanano (hereinafter "Hanano"). Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanano in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,097,128 to Matsumoto (hereinafter "Matsumoto").

The objection to claim 13 and the rejection of claims 1 and 7 under 37 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are now moot in light of the amendments to these claims.

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-14 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-12 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a light shutter on the liquid crystal display panel operable to transmit and shut off a light emitted from the liquid crystal display panel during every field period." Claims 13 and 14 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "opening the light shutter at an initial interval upon application of the video data and closing the light shutter in a maintenance interval maintaining the video data to shut off a light from the liquid crystal display panel during every frame." Hanano does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action the Examiner refers to Figs. 4c and 4f as teaching this feature. But, Hanano does not teach this feature of claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-14. The field synchronizing signal shown in Fig. 4f is only applied every other frame, and this is contrary to the present invention. The Examiner in the rejection of these claims only provides a general assertion that these features are taught in Hanano and does not address this argument that Hanano lacks at least this

feature of the present invention. Accordingly claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-14 are allowable over Hanano.

The rejection of claims 2 and 5 is respectfully traversed. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-14, Hanano fails to teach the features discussed above. Matsumoto fails to cure this deficiency of Hanano, so claims 2 and 5 are allowable over Hanano and Matsumoto.


Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 16, 2006

By 
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No. 40,106
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant